Drew 3

DREW MODEL SCHOOL

1971-72

"The Past is Prologue"

DREW MODEL SCHOOL - 1971-72 - "The Past is Prologue"

I INTRODUCTION

You are about to read a biased, non-objective assessment and evaluation of the Drew Model School's first year. Equal time should be afforded those with contrary views.

The task to establish a model school in little more than three weeks was an overwhelming one. That it has succeeded (it is still in existence in 1972) is due to the dedication, enthusiasm, and limitless energy of the staff, the children, and the parents of Drew. I thank them. Also, it could not have happened without the vision, confidence, and continued support of the School Board, Dr. Robert Chisholm - Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Harold Wilson - Associate Superintendent for Instruction, and Mrs. Gennette Nygard - Director of Elementary Programs. They, too, have my thanks.

Beth Hoffman

Beth S. Hoffman
Principal

October 3, 1972

II ORIGIN OF DREW MODEL SCHOOL

A. Genesis

On June 25, 1971, the Arlington School Board proposed a plan to eliminate the last remaining vestige of segregation in the Arlington school system. Included in the desegregation plan was a "vision" of a model school, an alternative instructional program for elementary school students, to be located in the Drew building and operated on an integrated basis in 1972-73. It was decided that during 1971-72, the Drew School facility would be used only for the Montessori pre-kindergarten, the Drew kindergarten, adult education, and Recreation Department classes.

In June of 1971, it was felt that there was not time enough for planning nor funds available to implement the model school concept for the current school year. However, by July 27, 1971, the County Board had voted to go forward with the visionary school, and indeed, by September 27, 1971, the Drew Model School became a reality.

In two months, the principal, team leaders, teaching staff, and aides were recruited, interviewed, recommended, and hired.

A description of the Drew Model School Program was written and released to the public.

Procedures for applying to the school were established and circulated in all of the elementary schools in the County. Application forms were developed, printed, and distributed with letters of information.

A gift of time - three weeks beyond the opening of the other schools in Arlington was used by the staff to develop its philosophy, program and schedule, to arrange and set up rooms, to inventory and order instructional supplies and equipment prior to the school's opening on September 27, 1971.

The year ahead was one of trial and error, laughter and tears, exaltation and exasperation, but also a year that changed the world of every child, parent, and staff member who had the privilege of volunteering for a great educational adventure and had taken advantage of it.

B. Selection of Staff

On July 27, 1971, the Personnel Office announced a vacancy for the principalship at the model school for the 1971-72 session.

In addition to the professional administrative duties regularly assigned to an elementary school principal, the responsibilities of this position fell into three major categories. These were:

1. Plan, organize, and direct an innovative educational program which could serve as a model for instructional improvement in the total elementary educational system.

2. Plan and coordinate a program of teacher training for the staff of the model school and for all other elementary teachers for whom the school would serve as a clinical training center.

3. Work with citizens to develop the model school as a community center.

On July 30, 1971, Dr. Robert L. Chisholm, Superintendent, notified all staff members of available vacancies at the model school. There were vacancies for 3 team leaders, 9 elementary classroom teachers, and 1 physical education teacher. It was expected that teachers from the various schools in the County would volunteer for these positions.

After the principal was selected, she interviewed the fourteen applicants for the three team leader positions. The three finally recommended and hired participated in the interviewing of all other applicants for the model school. They and the principal chose teachers and aides for each team.

C. Nature of the Staff

The staff, as chosen, had many characteristics in common. None were satisfied with the "status quo" in their professional lives. All were experienced and all had their own dreams of education; they were idealistic, but pragmatic. All had deep concerns about elementary school children - their life and learning styles. There was a general consensus that team teaching should be utilized and that the whole school should in a sense, be one team with common philosophies and objectives.

The staff did differ in regard to educational backgrounds, special expertise and interests, talents, hobbies, and teaching styles.

There was not a "yes man" in the group; they were articulate and ready to debate or discuss anything considered to be of importance to the school.

The staff complemented each other. They had respect for each other, both personally and professionally. Though each had his own way of reacting to stress, everyone showed an understanding for the individual. It was a beautiful staff! They didn't even mind having an inexperienced principal!

It was interesting to note that the teaching staff (grades 1-6) came from 38% of Arlington's elementary schools (Abingdon, Barrett, Claremont, Drew, Glencarlyn, Hoffman-Boston, Jackson, McKinley, Oakridge, and Page) and Blacks constituted 35% of the model school teaching staff.

D. Selection of Students

Quotas were assigned to each school attendance area as follows:

School	Student Quota	School	Student Quota
Abingdon	12	Maury	6
Ashlawn	6	McKinley	6
Barcroft	6	Nottingham	12
Barrett	6	Oakridge	12
Claremont	6	Page	6
Clay-Fillmore	6	Randolph	12
Custis	6	Reed	12
Fairlington	6	Taylor	18
Fort Myer	6	Tuckahoe	12
Glebe	12	Woodmont	6
Glencarlyn	12	Hoffman Boston Attendance Area	12
Jackson	6	Drew Attendance Area	48
Jamestown	12		
Key	18	Black-White ratio	
Madison	6		
		20% Black	
		80% White	

Letters of explanation and applications were distributed to each child in Arlington's elementary schools during the first week of school beginning on September 7, 1971.

Application forms were to be completed by parents and returned to the school offices by September 14.

It was believed that by volunteering to be students at Drew, pupils and their parents would be supportive of the objectives of the school and would be generally representative of the regular school, grades 1-6 student population. Because specially trained personnel were not at Drew, special education students were not eligible for model school placement.

These procedures were established:

1. If a school's quota was not filled by September 14, its excess slots would be assigned to other elementary schools.

2. Each school in which applications exceeded the quota and the additional slots allotted to it was to conduct an open lottery to determine which of the applicants was to be admitted. This lottery was to be held on the evening of September 16 at the school.

   Since only Drew School area applications to the model school exceeded the allotted quota, a lottery was held in that area on September 16. One hundred and one applications were pulled by one of the applicants, a sixth grader, who, incidentally, picked her own application to fill one of the forty-eight slots open to the Drew community.

   A waiting list was then maintained at the model school for the Drew area pupils who had applied and had not been selected.

3. Parents were to be notified of children's acceptances the week of September 20, 1971.

4. All pupils who were to attend the model school were to continue to receive instruction in their sending school through Friday, September 24.

5. On the morning of Monday, September 27, the children were to be transported by bus or were to walk to the Drew Model School and would no longer be pupils of the sending schools.

6. From September 20 on, applications would be accepted at each sending school and assigned to a waiting list. Each application would receive a number on a first-come, first-served basis. If vacancies did occur in the school, pupils would be selected from the waiting lists at the end of each reporting period.

7. A Pro Tem Committee consisting of at least one parent representative from each school in the County as well as representatives from the Drew and Hoffman Boston School areas met at the model school to recommend that any child who entered the model school as a student would not be considered for transfer back to his sending school until an orientation period of twelve weeks had elapsed. After this "try-out period", any child who was unhappy or could not adjust was to have a conference with his parents, teachers and principal. After study, a decision, in the best interests of the child, would be made.

E. Nature of the Student Population

On September 22, 1971, a survey was made of the model school's pupil population, grades 1-6: Proposed maximum enrollment (grades 1-6) - 300

Total Model School enrollment		287
Included were pupils from		
Hoffman Boston Area	9	
Drew Area	51	
Other schools in County	227	
Number of applications from the Drew Area as of Sept. 17, 1971		101
Number of applicants who wanted to return to the Drew Model School after the lottery and after each pupil drawn was contacted		51*

Black-White count from other schools

School	White	Black
Abingdon	8	-
Ashlawn	2	-
Barcroft	16	-
Barrett	2	-
Claremont	12	-
Clay-Fillmore	25	-
Custis	1	-
Fairlington	25	-
Ft. Myer	-	4
Glebe	10	-
Glencarlyn	3	-

School	White	Black
Henry	13	2
Jackson	8	-
Jamestown	4	-
Key	7	-
Madison	8	-
McKinley	15	-
Nottingham	5	-
Oakridge	7	-
Page	1	-
Randolph	13	-
Reed	5	-
Taylor	4	-
Tuckahoe	8	-
Woodmont	19	-
TOTAL	221	6

*There were three general reasons given for the decision of the fifty applicants to remain in their new schools:

1. The pupils were happy where they were
2. Parents resented the lottery selection method
3. When some children in a family were not selected among the first fifty, parents decided not to split their family.

On the opening day of school, Drew's population (grades 1-6) had changed to 245, a drop of forty-two students. These forty-two who had applied and had been accepted, changed their minds by the first day of school or had come to the realization that they had not meant to apply - (some parents thought they were filling out emergency forms; some thought they were enrolling in a modelling course for girls; many foreign parents did not understand what the application form implied).

In November, a Parent Survey was made to determine why and how children had decided to attend the model school:

1. "Who suggested your child come to Drew Model School?"

The Child, himself	- 19	- 13.1%
The Father	- 11	- 7.6%
The Mother	- 52	- 35.8%
Both Parents	- 26	- 17.9%
Parents & Child	- 12	- 8.3%

1. Continued

Teacher at Sending School	- 7	- 4.8%
Principal at Sending School	- 7	- 4.8%
A Friend, Brother of Child, etc.	- 3	- 4.1%

2. "For what reason was the transfer suggested?" These were the most frequent responses:

To obtain Individual Help	- 21	- 14.5%
To have pupil work at own rate	- 15	- 10.3%
To have better teachers and methods	- 14	- 9.7%
To benefit from a new program of studies	- 14	- 9.7%
To attend school closer to home	- 12	- 7.6%
To get away from a completely structured classroom	- 9	- 6.2%
To be in a more flexible situation	- 6	- 4.1%
To have a lower pupil-teacher ratio	- 6	- 4.1%
To be in a school which has a philosophy of freedom	- 6	- 4.1%
To be in another school setting	- 3	- 2.1%
To be motivated	- 3	- 2.1%
To have integration in the County go in another "direction"	- 3	- 2.1%

3. "Did any member of your family visit Drew Model School prior to enrolling your child?"

Yes - 53 - 36.6% No - 87 - 60%

"Did the visit influence the decision to transfer?"

Yes - 39 - 26.9% No - 16 - 11%

4. "Who made the final decision that your child enroll in Drew Model School?"

Child	- 20	- 13.8%
Father	- 6	- 4.1%
Mother	- 33	- 22.8%
Both Parents	- 51	- 35.2%
Parents and Child	- 20	- 13.8%
Other, Grandmother, friends, etc.	- 5	- 3.6%
No response	- 10	- 2.8%

5. "Did your child want to come to Drew Model School?"

Yes	- 112	- 77.2%	Yes and No	- 12	- 8.3%
No	- 17	- 11.7%	No response	- 4	- 2.8%

Drew's Child Development Consultant studied all cumulative folders to find that 40 percent of the model school population had difficulties of behavior and/or learning serious enough to involve the help of psychological services or a CDC on at least one occasion during the child's educational career. Ten percent had speech problems that warranted therapy. Twenty-five percent of the students were considered, by testing or teacher judgment, to be academically talented or able - superior students.

Included in Drew's population were children whose total school experience had been in self-contained classrooms. Some had had a year or two in a team teaching situation, but none had come from a school where team teaching was the school's sole organizational plan.

III OBJECTIVES

A. Principal Objectives

The Drew Model School had the following stated objectives for 1971-72:

1. To create and develop alternative organizational patterns to facilitate an individualized instructional program to meet the needs of all pupils.

2. To develop and/or maintain basic academic skills at a performance level consistent with the individual pupil's potential for achievement in an informal atmosphere.

3. To involve actively the parents of the pupils to create with the staff the curriculum patterns of the school and to coordinate the efforts of the home and the school in the development of each pupil's cognitive, affective, and psicho-motor development.

B. Other Objectives - unstated in writing, but nevertheless held to be attainable were:

4. To encourage and involve teachers-team leaders in every aspect of the selection of personnel and administration of the school.

5. To initiate visitation and participation by teachers throughout the County.

6. To provide opportunities for pupils to interact with parents and staff in regard to such items as recommendations for development and improvement of the plant, the curriculum, and the written report card.

7. To enable children to engage in and learn about leisure time activities and skills.

8. To maintain positive attitudes and relationships and to promote trust between individuals.

9. To encourage a love of and feeling of excitement toward learning.

10. To keep the lines of communication open on every level.

C. Degree to which the objectives were accomplished

1. Organizational Patterns

The model school was divided into three teams, each to serve a maximum of 100 pupils. Teachers were assigned on a pupil-teacher allocation formula of 25/1. Each team had two teacher aides to assist with instruction.

Team I consisted of combination classes of first and second graders - six, seven, and eight years of age. The team was staffed by four teachers, one of whom was the team leader, and two teacher aides.

Team II consisted of combination classes of third and fourth graders - eight, nine and ten years of age. The team was staffed by three full-time teachers, one of whom was the team leader, a half-time language arts resource techer who spent the major part of her time in Team II, but who supervised student publications for the school, and a half-time vocal music teacher who instructed all pupils, grades one through six. Two teacher aides completed the team.

Team III consisted of combinatinn classes of fifth and sixth graders - ten, eleven, and twelve years of age. The team was staffed by four teachers, one of whom was the team leader, and two teacher aides.

Each classroom teacher had no more than twenty-five children assigned to her for "contact" purposes. They were children from different sending schools, different socio-economic backgrounds, different characteristics, abilities, and values. They met together for reasons of socialization, for class discussions to solve class or whole school problems of behavior, dress, or safety, for setting daily or weekly instructional schedules, for team or school evaluation as well as for physical education, music and art.

Diagnosis and observation were continuous throughout the year. Children were reorganized for skills learning, particularly in the areas of reading/language arts and mathematics. Instruction was personalized and was based on Arlington County's sequential behavioral objectives. No one group remained constant, but no individual crossed teams for reading/language arts and mathematics. Teachers, through experience, found for instance, that they could tailor a sixth grade reading program for a first grader, if need be, and that the pupil achieved; and seemed comfortable and confident remaining with

his peers. When moved to an older age group, the same child appeared to be uneasy and tense - downright unhappy.

2. The Instructional Program

The supportive staff in addition to the instructional teams included the principal, the child development consultant, the librarian, the reading teacher, the physical education teacher, one educational secretary, one and one-half instructional secretaries, and five custodians.

Every teacher taught every subject area. There was no departmentalization. However, the reading teacher and a talented classroom teacher assigned to Team III maintained reading and mathematics laboratories for those children, regardless of team, who needed to strengthen, extend, or enrich skills and concepts.

During the morning hours, skills based on individual needs were invariably presented and practiced. These skills were applied throughout the afternoon in science, social studies, literature, and the arts. Groups were flexible, generally based upon interests and many children engaged in individual pursuits. The library, divided into two areas, "The Book Nook" housing fiction and the "Library Downstairs" housing reference and non-fictional works, was heavily used.

Teachers were responsive to children's needs and interests. The emphasis was always on learning rather than on teaching. The focus was on each child's thinking and problem solving processes and on his ability to communicate with others.

Materials, learning experiences, centers and stations were provided to emphasize the development of independence, creativity, and critical thought. A school handbook was developed; a pupil newspaper was written, published and distributed; a yearbook was produced and sold.

Children and teachers met together to set realistic goals and then met again to evaluate their attainment. This was the basis for the development of a continuous progress report in lieu of the County's reporting system.

The learning atmosphere was open to varying learning and teaching styles; it was based on success, not failure; it was informal, but not "free" and finally, it was conducive to a feeling of rapport, high morale, friendliness, and good humor. This atmosphere was felt and exclaimed about by all visitors to the school.

3. Pupil and Parent Involvement

Teachers, parents and pupils were actively involved in every aspect of the school. The principal was always available. During the children's lunch hour, they were able to come to the office as individuals or in small groups to discuss the school's, a team's or one person's particular concerns. Many worthwhile solutions were mutually arrived at and one notable by-product was that the principal became a person and a friend, not just the school's disciplinarian.

Older pupils taught younger pupils. Boys and girls in Team III "adopted" individual students in Team I for tutoring in handwriting, association of sounds to the letters of the alphabet, and addition and subtraction facts.

A curriculum committee, consisting of nineteen parents, five teachers, and five pupils from the three teams met regularly to learn about Drew's instructional program and materials, specific subject area needs, and ways parents could be involved in the solution of curriculum problems. To do this, subcommittees, one for each curriculum area, were formed. Out of this, came suggestions for additions to the library, tutoring of individual pupils in reading/language arts, a visit to a computer company for interested and able math students, the painting and refurbishing of the art lab, henceforth known as "The Paint Pot", a volunteer program conducted by twenty-two parents who engaged in two workshops in order to assure each child in the school an art experience at least once a week in the Paint Pot. Also, parents on this committee, contributed materials and expertise to enrich the school's science program.

A New Report Card Committee had to be formed when it was found that the County reporting system was inadequate to the demands of the continuous learning program at Drew. Nine mothers, four boys and girls, and four staff members developed and tested new reporting procedures during the school year.

What you have read, up to now, however, was not the complete instructional program at Drew. As the staff studied the educatinn they were hoping to provide for students, they came to the realization that many children of today know little or nothing about leisure-time and work-oriented skills. It was therefore decided that one and a half hours per week was to be used to further these particular skills. Teachers, aides, custodians, secretaries, and 50 parents contributed their time, their talents, and their expertise to "Children's Choice", one of the most popular of Drew's undertakings. It was during two 45-minute periods or a 90-minute period each week that children engaged in learning chess, pinochle, tie dyeing, making dried flower arrangements, cooking, baking, sweeping with sawdust, photography, using audio-visual equipment, modern dance, yoga, first aid, office work, helping Montessori and kindergarten children. The listing could go on, but this will suffice to

give the reader some inkling of the breadth of talent provided by staff and parents - and even by other adults in the community who had no ties to Drew.

IV THE INFLUENCE OF DREW ON THE PUBLIC AND PROFESSIONAL COMMUNITIES

A. Participation by Parents

As has been stated heretofore, the involvement of parents was great. Each month, a newsletter "Keeping Current" was written by the principal and distributed to each household. The parents responded to every request, every question that was asked in its pages.

There was no formal PTA at Drew Model School in 1971-72, but parents and teachers met together on three different occasions. At the first, on October 12, 290 adults ate a pot-luck supper and learned about the year's plans from individual teams. On January 11, more than 150 adults participated in an evening of "Parents' Choice". For forty-five minutes, parents were engaged in a "Teach-In" to have a taste of learning, Drew style. Choices ranged from using Cuisenairre Rods in mathematics to using the AAAS Program in Science, from Art to Speech, from using the DISTAR Program to the flexible Language Experience Approach in beginning reading. The third and last meeting of parents, teachers and prospective Drew parent applicants took place on May 25. It was called "Walking Happy" and 400 adults were able to see and hear about the highlights of Drew's first year from teachers and students.

Other committees of volunteer parents and pupils were formed and did their share toward making the school a worthwhile endeavor. There was a Telephone Committee, a Health Testing Committee, a Field Trip Chaperone Committee, a Typing Committee and a Fund-Raising Committee.

B. Interst of the Public in General

Presentations concerning staff, student body, organization, curriculum and administration of Drew School were requested and made to:

1. Drew Community Civic Association
2. Arlington Curriculum Advisory Council
3. AAUW (Arlington Branch)
4. Ten elementary teachers from Tennessee
5. Montgomery County, Md. Superintendent, supervisors, and two Board members
6. Five students from Norfolk State College
7. D.C. Citizen's Committee for Better Education
8. Twelve teachers and principals from Spotsylvania, Virginia
9. Principal and teachers from East Silver Springs Elementary School, Md.

10. Beta Chapter, Phi Delta Gamma at George Washington University
11. TV Stations - Channels 4, 7, and 9
12. Newspapers - The Sun, Evening Star, and the Post

In all, as the guest book in the Drew Model School office attests, 250 visitors, laymen and professionals, came to Drew during its first year.

C. Drew as a Community Center during the School Year

The Drew School facility was used in addition to housing the model school for the following purposes:

1. The Montessori Pre-School Program consisting of four classes for approximately 90 three and four year olds taught by two teachers trained at the Montessori International Institute. These young children came from the Drew-Wakefield School area.

2. Four Kindergarten Classes for approximately 72 five year olds from the Drew Community were taught by two kindergarten teachers who had taught at Drew the year before.

3. Extended Day Care was provided for children (grades K-6) of working mothers from the Drew area from 7:30 a.m. to 9:00 a.m., from 3:30 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. daily. Our Lady Queen of Peace Day Care Center used one of Drew's classrooms for 13 a.m. Montessori children to extend their day from noon until 6:00 p.m. daily.

4. Adult Programs such as an Adult Basic Education Program was housed at Drew to provide high school credit programs, basic skills in mathematics, reading and English for educationally disadvantaged and foreign speaking adults, as well as an adult Clerical Office Training Education Program for out-of-school adults. A Manpower Development Program was also established.

5. The Arlington Recreation Program from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. daily, and during the week-end. This program emphasized physical activity.

6. The Church of God met each Sunday for services in two of the classrooms.

7. The Teen Center sponsored Friday or Saturday night dances and large meetings during the year in the multipurpose room.

8. Fund-raising affairs such as fashion shows, fairs, and revivals were held by various churches and civic organizations on the week-ends.

9. A Reading Clinic was established by the County School System to diagnose and recommend treatment for Arlington's elementary school children with severe reading disabilities. Reading teachers referred children to the clinic.

   Pupils who were admitted to the clinic usually stayed for one to three weeks. During that time, in addition to receiving testing and instruction by the reading clinician, the children were assigned to teams in the model school.

D. The Drew Community Summer Project

What do you do when you have too much of a good thing?

Through the winter months, Mr. Ernest Johnson and Mr. Moss Duncan, representing the Arlington Recreation Department, Mr. Percy Scott, representing the Veterans Memorial YMCA and Mrs. Beth Hoffman, representing the Arlington County School System met regularly to discuss this dilemma and came to a conclusion that would benefit children and parents living in the Drew School Community.

Each agency offered something worthwhile, educational, and fun, but as we talked we realized that we were competing against each other and asking children to make choices at a "smorgasbord" of necessary and basic, yet tantalizing "foods".

We finally decided to work together to offer Drew School community children from six to twelve years of age an opportunity to have all the excitement and learning we felt we could provide.

This project, as planned, did not preclude any school age child from attending summer school elsewhere in the County and many from the Green Valley and Nauck areas did go to summer school centers.

Children from other neighborhoods were invited, but no bus transportation was provided to Drew during the summer of '72. Parents from Fairlington, Randolph and Abingdon School areas brought their children each day at 8:15 a.m., sleepy-eyed and often half-awake, and then called for them at 5:00 p.m. after a strenious but relaxing day from July 10 to August 4.

Ninety-six boys and girls, from kindergarten through sixth grade came and worked and played - all together for four short happy weeks.

Each child participated in an academic program geared primarily to motivate youngsters who were generally reluctant learners and who needed help in the academic areas of reading/language arts and mathematics for two hours every day. Five teachers from the Drew Model School taught groups that were divided according to age, needs, and abilities. Eight NYC workers, neighborhood high school students, assisted them in various ways.

Each child engaged in purposeful and interesting activities involving art, music, cooking and physical development for another two hours every day. Three Recreation Department workers, two representatives from the Cooperative Extension Service and one Model School Teacher's Aide worked hard to enable boys and girls to gain independence, self-confidence and skills.

By 12:15 each day, the youngsters were ready for the great out-doors. Kindergarten children were dismissed, but the others were able to purchase milk before eating their bag lunches in the covered shelter area. Three Recreation Department employees supervised lunch, games, arts and crafts and outdoor activities.

Three times a week the children swam at the Veterans Memorial Branch YMCA pool.

On rainy afternoons the whole group moved indoors to play in Drew's multipurpose room.

This was not all. The library was open daily from 8:15 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Children could hear stories, borrow books, read, watch movies, or have a quiet time drawing or writing about favorite story characters.

On July 27 boys and girls from four to twelve years of age came to the library to choose new paperback books to keep and enjoy. The Reading is Fundamental (RIF) program was initiated that Thursday by ladies from the Service League of Northern Virginia in cooperation with the Veterans Memorial YMCA. Gallons of lemonade and pounds of cookies were consumed by the 300 children in the community who gladly availed themselves of books for their very own. This program will continue at the Y throughout the fall and winter of 1972-73.

The Recreation Department sponsored an afternoon excursion to the Enchanted Forest and the children were so enchanted that parents waited hours for their return.

Our child development consultant met with youngsters who wanted help in solving personal problems or who had been referred by their teachers because they exhibited behavior that required discussion and change.

One secretary had the difficult job of keeping the wheels in motion - and she did.

A principal intern gained his first administrative "wings" by being in charge two days a week.

At the end of the month, pupils, parents and staff were surveyed as to their evaluation of Drew's Community Summer Project. The vast majority shared the opinion that it was a success, that it should be continued in 1973, and that all had gained something in the doing of it. Pupils particularly enjoyed being involved in applying skills to practical life experiences.

Parents enjoyed knowing that their children were learning and being taken care of while they worked, took courses, or had time to relax. Teachers enjoyed using new materials, making new friends - young and old, and trying new teaching techniques.

It was a good summer!

E. Participation by Arlington's Professional Personnel

Money was provided in the model school budget for released time for teachers from other elementary schools in Arlington to spend a minimum of two and a maximum of five days at Drew. With this time, teachers could do more than observe, visit, or "walk through".

One hundred days were used by twenty-five teachers from December to May.

Teachers seemed to be interested in every aspect of the Model School. They spent time in classes, participated in team meetings, found new materials and activities in the math laboratory, observed the reading clinician in action, watched Montessori youngsters engaged in practical life experiences. They observed the child development consultant work with groups and helped the librarian with her many and varied tasks. Some taught lessons or demonstrated their hobby in Children's Choice.

At the end of the participation period, each teacher wrote an evaluation. All were positive and encouraging; some had suggestions for improving procedures for application and participation for this type of staff development.

The laboratory aspect of the Model School had its beginning!

V CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

One reasonable way to evaluate the success of an alternative school is to examine what choices are made one year later when a similar opportunity is again presented to those who originally chose the alternative. The data below is presented as a simplified but very important measure of the success of the Drew Program during its first year of operation.

1. In a survey made on August 15, 1972, 301 pupils from twenty-five of the elementary schools were registered for the 1972-73 school year.

   Of the 301 children, 62 were Black, 3 were Oriental, and 236 were White.

2. It was also determined that 85% of the children registered in 1971-72 applied to return as students in 1972-73. Ten percent of these children moved out of the County and five percent returned to their sending schools.

3. There was also a waiting list of 55 names. Thirty-four of the children on this list were White, twenty-one were Black. As vacancies occur, parents of these children will be contacted.

4. Sixty-seven percent of the Model School's staff have returned for the 1972-73 school year.

Recommendations are limited to just a few:

1. The school budget for 1973-74 requests improvements in the building and its equipment.

2. Approval is sought for a school-developed report card.

3. Assessment and evaluation procedures for Drew's annual report should include some objective data on student performance.